



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/034,601	12/26/2001	Sermet Yucel	1578.001US1	1967
34205	7590	08/16/2006		
OPPENHEIMER WOLFF & DONNELLY LLP 45 SOUTH SEVENTH STREET, SUITE 3300 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402				
			EXAMINER ROCHE, TRENTON J	
			ART UNIT 2193	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 08/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/034,601	YUCEL, SERMET	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Trenton J. Roche	2193	

All Participants:

(1) Trenton J. Roche.

(2) Dena VanDeVoort Ehrich, Reg. No. 57,508.

Status of Application: _____

(3) Craig Lervick.

(4) Kakali Chaki, SPE 2193.

Date of Interview: 24 July 2006, 27 July 2006,

Time: 10:00 AM EST

Type of Interview: 1 August 2006

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

1

Prior art documents discussed:

Althoff

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Kakali Chaki

**KAKALI CHAKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**

[Signature]

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Initially, Applicant's representatives discussed the general concept of what the invention, and specifically how the concept as a whole is fundamentally different from typical relational database systems, in that the invention is taking sets of logical "black boxes" and linking them together according to logic rules to form a derived executable application. The Examiner noted that the concepts are fundamentally different, however, the language of the claim was still sufficiently broad to leave open the possibility of an interpretation in line with a relational database, and that an amendment excluding this interpretation was desired. Applicant's representatives noted the use of the phrase "logic details" in claim 1, stating that the logic details are different from data residing in a database. However, the Examiner stated that he interprets all data in a database to represent logic, and would still be considered "logic details." After further consideration, Applicant's representatives proposed the addition of details outlining that the logic details are specifically application logic details, directed towards the general goal of building an executable application. The Examiner agreed that the addition of a wherein clause outlining how the logic details are more than just data, that they are specifically application "black boxes" or otherwise data, intended for combination to form an overall application, would preclude the ability to use a relational database reference in any sort of rejection. Applicant's representatives took these suggestions and submitted newly proposed amendments. The Examiner reviewed these proposed amendments with SPE Chaki and presented thoughts concerning the amendments to Applicant's representative in an interview on 27 July 2006, specifically, that it was desired that the specifics of how the logic details are utilized in the overall invention or "big picture" of creating knowledge oriented applications, as a way to tie the steps of the invention together. In response, Applicant's representative submitted newly revised proposed amendments including the requested details of how the logic details interact with the overall system. After a meeting with SPE Chaki, the Examiner set up a final telephone interview on 1 August 2006, in which Applicant's representatives, SPE Chaki and the Examiner were all present. Final details about the latest claim amendments, along with additional thoughts as how to tie the claim language together were presented. Applicant's representatives took these comments, made one more revision of the claim language, and submitted the proposed amendments to the Examiner. Aside from a minor change, these changes put the application in condition for allowance.